UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,337	03/02/2005	Kenichi Nakamura	NAKA0102PUSA	8947
	10/526,337 03/02/2005 Kenichi Nakamura	EXAMINER		
			HUYNH, KHOA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ere e	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/526,337	NAKAMURA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Khoa D. Huynh	3751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a						
Period for Reply		·				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17	May 2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-17 is/are withdra	awn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner					
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 March 2005</u> is/are		biected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		···				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	Examiner. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>	an priority under 25 H C C	\$ 110(a) (d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreiga) All b) Some * c) None of:	in priority under 35 0.5.C.	9 119(a)-(u) or (i).				
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received	•				
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr						
application from the International Bure	•					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ot received.				
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of 6) Other: _	f Informal Patent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species 5 (as depicted in Fig. 13) in the reply filed on 05/17/2007 is acknowledged.

Applicant indicates in the reply that claims 1-12 are readable on the elected species. Accordingly, claims 13-17 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to the non-elected inventions.

Drawings

2. The drawings, especially elected Figures 13-14, are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the first water spouting section is installed...at a point near a point where the radius of curvature of the bowl changes from a smaller value to a larger value and the second water spouting section is installed...at a point near a point where the radius of curvature of the bowl changes from a larger value to a smaller value as recited in claim 4 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,

and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-5, 8, 10 and 11, as presently understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Groeniger (2158362).

Regarding claim 1, the Groeniger reference discloses a flush toilet that uses a prescribed amount of cleansing water stored in a cleansing water tank to cleanse the toilet and discharge waste. The flush toilet includes a bowl (at 10) having a bowl-shaped waste receiving surface, a rim (at 29) constituting an upper edge portion whose inner surface overhangs inward and a shelf (at 28) formed between the rim and the waste receiving surface (Fig. 2), and a drainage channel (at 15) whose inlet is connected to the bottom of the bowl for discharging waste.

A first water spouting section (at 32a on the left side) for spouting cleansing water onto the shelf of the bowl to form a vortex; a second water spouting section (at 32a on the right side) for spouting cleansing water onto shelf of the bowl in the same direction as the swirling direction of the vortex; a first water channel (at 32 on the left side) for supplying cleansing water from the cleansing water tank to the first water spouting section; and a second water channel (at 32 on the right side) for supplying cleansing water from the cleansing water tank to the second water spouting section.

Regarding claim 2, as schematically shown in Figure 1, the second water channel makes a U-turn to communicate with the second water spouting section.

Regarding claims 3 and 8, the flush toilet further comprises a jet hole section (at 35) arranged to spout water toward the inlet (at 15b) of the drainage channel, wherein the amount of water spouted from the jet hole section is greater than the total amount of water spouted at the rim from the first water spouting section and second water spouting section (page 3, lines 13-17).

Regarding claims 4 and 5 (as best understood), as schematically shown in Figure 1, wherein the first water spouting section is installed on one side of the bowl relative to its fore-aft center axis at a point near a point where the radius of curvature of the bowl changes from a smaller value to a larger value and the second water spouting section is installed on the other side of the bowl at a point near a point where the radius of curvature of the bowl changes from a larger value to a smaller value, and wherein the amount of water spouted at the rim

from the first water spouting section is inherently greater than the amount of water spouted at the rim from second water spouting section.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, as schematically shown in Figure 1, wherein the shelf of the bowl is formed to vary in width in a manner that causes the main stream of the cleansing water spouted the first water spouting section to flow toward the inlet of the drainage channel, wherein the width of the shelf of the bowl is formed wider at regions on opposite lateral sides of the bowl relative to its fore-aft center axis and formed narrower at the front end region of the bowl.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 6, 7, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groeniger (as discussed supra).

Regarding claims 6, even though the Groeniger reference does not specifically disclose that the amount of water from 0.6 to 2.3 liters spouted from the spouting sections as claimed, it, however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ such amount of water for the spouting sections since discovering an optimum value for water flow of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 7, even though the Groeniger reference does not specifically disclose that the amount of spouted water of at least 1 liter as claimed, it, however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ such amount of water for the spouting sections since discovering an optimum value for water flow of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)*.

Regarding claims 9, even though the Groeniger reference does not specifically disclose that the capacity of the water tank is 6 liters, the amount of spouted water from 1-3 liters from the spouting sections, and the amount of water from the jet hole is 5-3 liters as claimed, it, however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ such amount of water for the tank, spouting sections and the jet hole since discovering an optimum value for water flow of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).*

Regarding claim 12, as schematically shown in Figure 2, the shelf of the bowl (constitute by the slope portion at 10) is sloped downward. Even though the Groeniger reference does not specifically disclose that the angle of inclination of 0 to 15 degrees as claimed, it, however, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ such angle of inclination for the shelf of the bowl since discovering an optimum value for an

downward angle of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khoa D. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571) 272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/526,337

Art Unit: 3751

Page 8

Khoa D. Huynh Primary Examiner Art Unit 3751

HK 06/10/2007